

REMARKS

The Office Action dated March 12, 2007 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Initially, Applicants note that the IDS filed December 31, 2003 has not been fully considered. Particularly, two non-patent references to Narten et al. and Arkko et al. in form PTO-1449 were not among the references considered by the Examiner on March 7, 2007. For the Examiner's reference, Applicants attach herewith the form PTO-1449 with the two references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to consider these references and provide Applicants with a copy of the form with the aforementioned references initialed.

By this Response, claims 1-7, 9-16, 18, 19, and 21-24 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. New claims 26-28 been added to further complete the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled. Claim 25 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter described therein. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-24 and 26-28 are pending, of which claims 1, 13, and 26-27 are independent claims. Approval and entry of the amendments are respectfully requested.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The Office Action contended that the recitation

“the Security-Client header” lacks proper antecedent basis. In response, Applicants have amended the claim to recite “a security-client header”. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §112, 2nd paragraph, rejection of claim 9.

Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Honeisen (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0255039). The Office Action contended that Honeisen describes all of the features in the rejected claims. In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection at least for the reason that Honeisen fails to describes or suggest all of the features in the rejected claims.

Independent claim 1, upon which claims 2-12 and 28 are dependent, is directed to a method of setting up a security association between a first node and a second node in a packet switched environment. The method includes forwarding a prefix value from the first node to the second node, wherein the prefix value referring to a portion of the internet protocol address associated with the first node, and creating a security association between the first node and the second node based on the prefix value.

Independent claim 13, upon which claims 14-24 are dependent, is directed to a system having a first node and a second node in a packet switched environment, wherein the first node is configured to forward its prefix value in a message to the second node, said prefix value referring to a portion of the internet protocol address of the first node, and wherein the second node is configured to create a security association with the first node based on the prefix value.

Independent claim 26 is directed to a communication terminal in a packet switched environment. The communication terminal includes a prefix value to be forwarded to a node in the packet switched environment to create a security association with the communication terminal said prefix value referring to a portion of the internet protocol address of the communication terminal.

Independent claim 27 is directed to a security association apparatus having a first communication means and a second communication means in a packet switched environment, forwarding means for forwarding a prefix value in a message from the first communication means to the second communication means, said prefix value referring to a portion of the internet protocol address of the first communication means, and creating means for creating a security association between the first communication means and the second communication means based on the prefix value.

As will be discussed below, each of the presently pending claims recite subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited prior art.

An embodiment of present invention is directed to a method of setting up a security association between two nodes using a prefix value. The prefix value refers to a portion of the IP address of the first node (i.e., user equipment, UE) as described in detail on page 8 to 10 of the specification. In an embodiment of the present invention, the prefix value, also referred to the prefix parameter, is the “addr-pref-length” field inserted into a security-client header, as described on page 8, line 29 to page 9, line 2 of the specification. Thus, an IP address may comprise a prefix, whose length is defined by the

prefix value, and some other identifier, as described on page 11, lines 9 to 23 of the specification. Claim 1, as shown above, recites that a security association between the first node and the second node is created “based on the prefix value”.

In contrast with Applicants’ invention, Honeisen generally describes a system for controlling sessions between terminals in a network by means of SIP for initiating, maintaining and terminating sessions, thereby creating a SIP interdependency between a first and a second terminal. The idea is to increase network reliability by creating separate SIP relations between each of the first and second terminals and a network element (see, for example, SIP relation UNI A, SIP relation NNI and SIP relation UNI B in Fig 2 of Honeisen), rather than using a single SIP relation between the first and second terminals, as shown in Fig 1 of Honeisen. The result is that each of the different SIP relations has a different call identification Call-ID header field.

However, Honeisen fails to disclose or suggest a method for setting up a security association between a first node and a second node as recited in claim 1 of the present invention. Applicants respectfully assert that Honeisen does not describe or suggest the concept of security associations. Consequently, Honeisen also fails to disclose “creating a security association between the first node and the second node based on the prefix value”, as recited in claim 1. Rather, Honeisen merely discloses the use of a plurality of SIP relations for communication between first and second terminals, with different Call-ID header fields associated with the different SIP relations. The Call-ID general-header field uniquely identifies a particular invitation or all registrations of a particular client.

Accordingly, Honeisen does not disclose, “forwarding a prefix value from the first node to the second node, said prefix value referring to a portion of the internet protocol address associated with the first node”, as recited in claim 1.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Honeisen is only concerned with the use of multiple SIP relations in the communication between first and second terminals. Accordingly, there is no description or suggestion of creating a security association based on such a prefix value as that recited in claim 1 of the present application.

For the same reasons as those given for claim 1, independent claims 13, 26 and 27 are distinguished over Honeisen.

As discussed above, Honeisen fails to teach, disclose, or suggest setting up a security association between a first node and a second node in a packet switched environment, forwarding a prefix value from the first node to the second node, wherein the prefix value referring to a portion of the internet protocol address associated with the first node, and creating a security association between the first node and the second node based on the prefix value, as recited in the pending claim 1, for example.

For similar reasons set forth above, Honeisen also fails to teach, disclose, or suggest a system having a first node and a second node in a packet switched environment, wherein the first node is configured to forward its prefix value in a message to the second node, said prefix value referring to a portion of the internet protocol address of the first node, and wherein the second node is configured to create a security association with the first node based on the prefix value, as recited in claim 13.

Honeisen is also devoid of any teach or suggestion of a communication terminal in a packet switched environment, wherein the terminal includes a prefix value to be forwarded to a node in the packet switched environment to create a security association with the communication terminal said prefix value referring to a portion of the internet protocol address of the communication terminal, as recited in claim 26.

Honeisen also fails to teach, disclose, or suggest a security association apparatus having a first communication means and a second communication means in a packet switched environment, forwarding means for forwarding a prefix value in a message from the first communication means to the second communication means, said prefix value referring to a portion of the internet protocol address of the first communication means, and creating means for creating a security association between the first communication means and the second communication means based on the prefix value, as recited in claim 27. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending obviousness rejection over Honeisen.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the claims 1-24 and 26-28 recites subject matter which neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited reference to Honeisen.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Luan C. Do
Registration No. 38,434

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800; Fax: 703-720-7802

LCD:jkm

Enclosures: Copy of Form PTO-1449 submitted with IDS filed on December 31, 2003
Petition for Extension of Time
Additional Claim Fee Transmittal